

1
2
3
4
5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
7 AT SEATTLE

8 BEHROUZ SHOKRI,

9 Plaintiff,

10 v.

11 THE BOEING COMPANY, a Delaware
12 corporation,

13 Defendant.

Case No. C16-1132 RSM

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION TO SEAL

14 This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion to Seal. Dkt. #135. Plaintiff
15 filed Exhibits EE and FF to the Supplemental Declaration of Scott C.G. Blankenship in Support
16 of Plaintiff's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment under seal. Dkts. #136, #137. Plaintiff filed
17 the exhibits under seal as they were marked "Confidential" by Defendant under the parties'
18 Protective Order. Dkt. #135 ¶¶ 1–2. Plaintiff does not argue that the exhibits should be kept
19 under seal. *Id.* Defendant's also does not argue that the exhibits should be kept under seal and
20 consents to the Court unsealing the exhibits.¹ Dkt. #138.

21
22 "There is a strong presumption of public access to the court's files." Local Rule CR 5(g).
23 The Court will not grant broad authority to file documents under seal simply because the parties
24 have designated them as confidential in the course of discovery. *Kamakana v. City & Cnty. of*
25

26 ¹ The Court does note that Plaintiff may not have made a good faith effort to confer with Defendant prior to filing the exhibits under seal, as required by Local Rule CR 5(g)(1)(A), and that Defendant may not have been afforded a reasonable opportunity to consent to public filing. Dkt. #138.

1 *Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1183 (9th Cir. 2006). As related to dispositive motions, a party seeking
2 to maintain the secrecy of documents must meet the high threshold of showing that “compelling
3 reasons” support secrecy. *Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at 1180. “In general, ‘compelling reasons’
4 sufficient to outweigh the public’s interest in disclosure and justify sealing court records exist
5 when such ‘court files might have become a vehicle for improper purposes,’ such as the use of
6 records to gratify private spite, promote public scandal, circulate libelous statements, or release
7 trade secrets.” *Id.* at 1179 (quoting *Nixon v. Warner Communications, Inc.*, 435 U.S. 589, 598
8 (1978)).
9

10 The Court, having reviewed Plaintiff’s Motion, Defendant’s Response, and the remainder
11 of the record, finds that no compelling reason supports sealing Exhibits EE and FF to the
12 Supplemental Declaration of Scott C.G. Blankenship in Support of Plaintiff’s Motion for Partial
13 Summary Judgment.

14 Accordingly, the Court ORDERS that Plaintiff’s Motion to Seal (Dkt. #135) is DENIED
15 and that Exhibits EE and FF to the Supplemental Declaration of Scott C.G. Blankenship in
16 Support of Plaintiff’s Motion for Partial Summary Judgment (Dkts. #136 and #137) shall be
17 immediately UNSEALED BY THE CLERK.
18

19 Dated this 16th day of February 2018.

20
21 

22 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
23 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
24
25
26